UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/380,412	01/19/2000	PATRIK LJUNGSTROEM	RIEB3.001APC	2586

20995 7590 03/29/2002

KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP
620 NEWPORT CENTER DRIVE
SIXTEENTH FLOOR
NEWPORT BEACH, CA 92660

EXAMINER
MEHRPOUR, NAGHMEH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2685	

DATE MAILED: 03/29/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)
09/380,412	Patrik Ljungstrom et al.
Examiner	**Art Unit**
Naghmeh Mehrpour	2685

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *Jan 7, 2002*

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL.** 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideratio

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:

1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
20) ☐ Other:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. **Claim 12-13, 15-16, 20, 22,** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Proudler European patent Application EP 0740482A1 in view of Inahara et al. EP European patent Application 0280196

Regarding **Claims 12-13, 15, 16, 20,** Proudler teaches a cordless communication system for the operation of a mobile terminal of a mobile communication system with a base station that is connected to a public fixed network and that is compatible at an air interface with the mobile communication system that has at least one authentication function (See figure 1 numerals 17, 12, 18, 65, 26, Column 1 lines 50-57, Column 5 lines 1-46). Proudler fails to teach a cordless communication system comprising:

a read/write unit within a base station, the read/write unit configured to read and write information from and to, respectively, at least one identification module, wherein sections of data of the identification module used in the base station are identical to sections of data on a chip card of an access-authorized mobile terminal; and software implemented in the base station for processing of data read from the identification module and for authenticating the

mobile terminal relative to the base station through the processed data, wherein the base station fulfills the same functions and tasks as the home location register and, respectively, the authentication center of the mobile communication system. However Inahara teaches a read/write unit within a base station, the read/write unit configured to read and write information from and to, respectively, at least one identification module, wherein sections of data of the identification module used in the base station are identical to sections of data on a chip card of an access-authorized mobile terminal; and software implemented in the base station for processing of data read from the identification module and for authenticating the mobile terminal relative to the base station through the processed data, wherein the base station fulfills the same functions and tasks as the home location register and, respectively, the authentication center of the mobile communication system (See figure 1 numerals 2, 1, Column 3 lines 28-55). Proudler teaches a cordless system that works with cellular system, and the cellular system usually contains the HLR/AUC . Inahara system Master unit is the base station that communicate wirelessly with the slaves unit (mobile stations). Therefore, it have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use above teaching of Inahara to Proudler, in order to provide a feasible cordless system that the base station functions as Home location register.

Regarding **Claim 22**, the combination of Proudler and Inahara fails to teach a cordless communication system wherein the predetermined standard is selected from the group consisting of ISO ID-1, ID-000, DCS 1800, and PCS 1900. However a cordless communication system wherein the predetermined standard is selected from the group consisting of ISO ID-1, ID-000,

DCS 1800, and PCS 1900 is well known in the art. Therefore, it have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use above teaching to the combination of Proudler and Inahara, in order to provide a system that can be operational with variety of different networks.

3. **Claims 14, 17-19,** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Proudler EP 0740482A1 and Inahara et al. EP 0280196 in view of VU (US Patent Number 6,156,436B1).

Regarding **Claim 14,** the combination of Proudler and Inahara does not mention that a method further comprising storing other data on the identification module and the other data including allowed frequencies, a maximum permitted output powers for the base station and the mobile terminal, allowed services, and initialization parameters which a network carrier desires to influence and which constitute a general framework for the operation of the base station of the cordless communication system. However Vu teaches a method of wireless communication that comprising storing date on the identification module in a which includes allowed frequencies, a maximum output powers for the base station and the mobile terminal allowed services, and initialization parameters which a network carrier desires to influence and which constitute a general framework for the operation of the base station of the cordless communication system (Column 5 lines 15-27). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use above teaching of Vu to the combination of Proudler and

Inahara, in order to enable the user easily use various cell phones with a single SIM card and maintain their preferred system parameter.

Regarding **Claims 17-19,** the combination of Proudler and Inahara fails to teach a method further comprising programming a timer within the base station to a predetermined time by a network carrier, and automatically resetting the timer by a subscriber if an authorized use occurs, wherein the base station, if not used after the predetermined time has lapsed, loses authorization to operate a transmitter at frequencies assigned to the mobile communication system. However Vu teaches a method of communication that comprising a timer within the base station to a predetermined time by a network carrier, and automatically resetting the timer by a subscriber if an authorized use occurs, wherein the base station, if not used after the predetermined time has lapsed, loses authorization to operate a transmitter at frequencies assigned to the mobile communication system (Column 5 lines 15-65). Therefore, it have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use above teaching of Vu to the combination of Proudler and Inahara, in order to efficiently and reliably prevent fraudulent use.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 12-22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure

Hurme (US Patent Number 6,341,220) disclose finding copied SIM

Shah et al. (US Patent Number 6,332,076) disclose method and system for identifying and analyzed downlink interference sources in a telecommunications network

6. **Any responses to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 308--6296, (for formal communications indented for entry)

Or:

(703) 308-6306, (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II. 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington. Va., sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Melody Mehrpour whose telephone number is (703) 308-7159. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday (first week of bi-week) and Monday through Friday (second week of bi-week) from 6:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

NM

March 12, 2002

EDWARD F. URBAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600